

TABLE 1: SUMMARY COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS

Action	Alternative 1: No Action – Continuation of the Current Interim Bison Management Plan	Alternative 2: Minimal Management	Alternative 3: Management, with Emphasis on Public Hunting	Alternative 4: Interim Plan with Limited Public Hunting and Quarantine	Alternative 5: Aggressive Brucellosis Control within Yellowstone National Park through Capture, Test, and Removal	Alternative 6: Aggressive Brucellosis Control within Yellowstone National Park through Vaccination	Alternative 7: Preferred Alternative – Manage for Specific Bison Population Range
Bison population range	No range specified in existing interim plan	Allow natural forces to determine herd size	Manage herd within range of natural variation: 1,700–3,500	Same as alternative 3	Manage herd size to prevent loss of genetic integrity and ensure success of disease control	Same as alternative 5	Manage herd within range of 1,700 to 2,500
Capture, test, and slaughter operations	Reese Creek: capture all bison at Stephens Creek facility inside park and ship to slaughter; West Yellowstone: capture, test, and ship seropositive males and females and all pregnant females to slaughter; test and release seronegative male and nonpregnant females on public land; capture facilities on national forest and/or private land used during winter months	Phase 1 same as alternative 1; phase 2 no capture, test, and slaughter operations	Reese Creek: in phase 1, ship all seropositives to slaughter, seronegatives to quarantine; in phase 2, capture facility between Yankee Jim Canyon and Reese Creek as backup to hunting; West Yellowstone: no capture facilities	Capture facilities same as alternative 1, except ship seronegatives from Reese Creek to quarantine	Temporary capture facilities throughout park; test; ship all seropositives to slaughter and release all seronegatives within park; Stephens Creek facility remains	Reese Creek: ship all captured bison to slaughter; West Yellowstone capture facility at Seven-Mile Bridge area inside park; test and ship seropositives to slaughter; test, vaccinate, and release all seronegatives onsite; phase 2 capture facilities same as alternative 5	Reese Creek: in phase 1, ship all seropositives to slaughter, seronegatives to quarantine; in phase 2, capture facility between Yankee Jim Canyon and Reese Creek; West Yellowstone: same as alternative 1, except quarantine all seronegatives at high population levels and all seronegative-pregnant bison at population mid range; capture facility at Horse Butte
Quarantine operations	No quarantine operations	No quarantine operations	Quarantine operations – take seronegatives from Stephens Creek in phase 1; relocate capture facility in phase 2	Quarantine operations – Reese Creek: quarantine all seronegatives; West Yellowstone: quarantine seronegative-pregnant females	No quarantine operations	No quarantine operations	Quarantine operations – take seronegatives from Stephens Creek in phase 1; West Yellowstone: quarantine seronegative-pregnant females; if population high, quarantine all seronegatives
Monitoring of bison	Aerial and ground reconnaissance of bison in and adjacent to park	Same as alternative 1	Same as alternative 1	Same as alternative 1	Same as alternative 1 and monitor bison to facilitate capture inside park	Phase 1, same as alternative 1; phase 2, same as alternative 5	Same as alternative 1
Bison hunting	No hunt	No hunt	If legislature approves, state of Montana institutes fair-chase hunt on public and private land in all SMAs; public hunt during winter (Oct.-Feb.) primary method to control population numbers and distribution	If legislature approves, state of Montana institutes fair-chase hunt on public lands; public recreational hunt during winter (Oct.-Feb.)	No hunt	No hunt	If legislature approves, state of Montana institutes fair-chase hunt on public lands at Eagle Creek/Bear Creek; in phase 2, hunting could be allowed on public lands in all SMAs
Bison management on public lands adjacent to Yellowstone National Park	Allow bison on public lands in Eagle Creek/Bear Creek except north of Little Trail Creek/Maiden Basin hydrographic divide; do not allow bison north of Reese Creek; do not allow bison in West Yellowstone area beyond May and until November 1	Allow bison on public lands in Eagle Creek/Bear Creek; in Gardiner Valley south of Yankee Jim Canyon; and south of Buffalo Horn Creek and east of Hebgen Lake in western area	Allow bison on public lands in Eagle Creek/Bear Creek except north of Little Trail Creek/Maiden Basin hydrographic divide; do not allow bison in West Yellowstone area beyond May and until November 1; in phase 1, bison not allowed north of Reese Creek; phase 2, bison allowed between Reese Creek and Yankee Jim Canyon	Same as alternative 1	Do not allow bison outside park; haze to return bison to interior of park	Same as alternative 1	Allow bison on public lands in Eagle Creek/Bear Creek except north of Little Trail Creek/Maiden Basin hydrographic divide; do not allow bison in West Yellowstone area beyond May and until November 1; in phase 1, bison not allowed north of Reese Creek; in phase 2, bison allowed between Reese Creek and Yankee Jim Canyon
Bison management on private lands adjacent to Yellowstone National Park	Remove bison at landowner request	Same as alternative 1	Bison hunted with landowner permission; remove at landowner request	Remove bison at landowner request; possible bison hunt under special and limited circumstances	Same as alternative 1	Same as alternative 1	Same as alternative 3
Surveillance testing of cattle	No change in existing cattle surveillance requirements	Require testing of susceptible cattle in SMA	Require testing of cattle in contact with bison	Same as alternative 3	Same as alternative 1	Require testing of cattle in high-risk areas in West Yellowstone	Whole herd surveillance protocols for cattle within SMAs recommended by APHIS

Action	Alternative 1: No Action – Continuation of the Current Interim Bison Management Plan	Alternative 2: Minimal Management	Alternative 3: Management, with Emphasis on Public Hunting	Alternative 4: Interim Plan with Limited Public Hunting and Quarantine	Alternative 5: Aggressive Brucellosis Control within Yellowstone National Park through Capture, Test, and Removal	Alternative 6: Aggressive Brucellosis Control within Yellowstone National Park through Vaccination	Alternative 7: Preferred Alternative – Manage for Specific Bison Population Range
Vaccination of cattle with RB51	Encourage calfhood vaccination of cattle adjacent to park	Encourage vaccination of all susceptible female cattle calves within SMA, adjacent to park or within 20-mile radius of either	Same as alternative 2	Same as alternative 2	Same as alternative 1	Same as alternative 2	Same as alternative 2
Vaccination of bison	Vaccinate bison calves after vaccine is developed that is safe and effective for bison using capture facilities and remote means	Same as alternative 1, using remote means only	Same as alternative 1	Same as alternative 1	Same as alternative 1	Same as alternative 1	Same as alternative 1
Modify national forest grazing allotments	No modification of national forest grazing allotments	Modification of national forest grazing allotments may occur	No modification of national forest grazing allotments expected in phase 1, but may occur in phase 2	Same as alternative 1	Same as alternative 1	Same as alternative 1	Same as alternative 3
Change in land use, easement, or acquisition of additional wildlife habitat	No change in existing land use/ownership	Easement or acquisition of additional winter wildlife habitat; or change from breeder cattle (susceptible cattle) to steers/spayed heifers within SMA	Similar to alternative 2, with reduced acquisition	Same as alternative 1	Same as alternative 1	Same as alternative 1	Phase 1, no change; phase 2, acquire additional winter range north of Reese Creek; no changes in cattle operations
Winter road grooming	No change in existing winter road management	Eliminate winter grooming and snowmobile use of some trails; research effects of closures on population numbers and on ability to keep bison within park boundaries	Research effects of road closures on bison	Same as a lternative 1	Plow roads in winter for access to bison capture facilities	Phase 1 - plow road to Seven-Mile Bridge capture facility; phase 2 - plow roads same as in alternative 5	Same as alternative 1
Total annual cost of alternative (includes one-time only costs such as quarantine, capture facilities, and land acquisition)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NPS – \$450,000 • USFS – \$15,000 • State of MT – \$140,000-\$420,000 • APHIS – \$183,000 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NPS – \$232,000 • USFS – \$170,000 • State of MT – \$150,000 • APHIS – \$30,000 • Shared costs (up to \$44.1 million) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NPS – \$488,000 • USFS – \$40,000 • State of MT – \$225,000 • APHIS – \$933,000-\$1,233,000 • Shared costs (up to \$33.1 million) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NPS – \$428,000 • USFS – \$25,000 • State of MT – \$408,000 • APHIS – \$1,078,000-\$1,378,000 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NPS – \$2,135,300-\$2,235,300 • USFS – \$15,000 • State of MT – 0 • APHIS – \$51,000 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NPS – \$745,000 (phase 1) • \$1,909,000 (phase 2) • USFS – \$15,000 • State of MT – \$142,000 (phase 1) • \$175,000 (phase 2) • APHIS – \$47,000 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NPS – \$733,000 • USFS – \$30,000 • State of MT – \$403,200 • APHIS – \$1,083,000-\$1,383,000 • Shared costs (up to \$29.1 million)

TABLE 2: COMPARISON OF FEATURES OF EACH ALTERNATIVE

Action	Alternative 1: No Action – Continuation of the Current Interim Bison Management Plan	Alternative 2: Minimal Management	Alternative 3: Management, with Emphasis on Public Hunting	Alternative 4: Interim Plan with Limited Public Hunting and Quarantine	Alternative 5: Aggressive Brucellosis Control within Yellowstone National Park through Capture, Test, and Slaughter	Alternative 6: Aggressive Brucellosis Control within Yellowstone National Park through Vaccination	Alternative 7: Preferred Alternative – Manage for Specific Bison Population Range
Agency-enforced boundary control at Reese Creek	✓	✓ (phase 1)	✓ (phase 1)	✓	✓	✓	✓(phase 1)
Agency enforced boundary control at Little Trail Creek/Maiden Basin divide	✓	✓ (phase 1)	✓	✓		✓	✓
Bison shot inside Eagle Creek/Bear Creek area			✓ (hunt)	✓ (hunt)	✓ (agency)		
Agency-enforced boundary at Yankee Jim Canyon (northern boundary beyond Reese Creek)		✓	✓ (phase 2)				✓ (phase 2)
Agency-enforced boundary at Cabin Creek area boundary on western side	✓		✓	✓		✓	✓
Agency-enforced boundary at Buffalo Horn Creek on western side		✓					
Capture facility at Stephens Creek (northern, Reese Creek boundary inside park)	✓	✓ (phase 1)	✓ (phase 1)	✓	✓	✓	✓(phase 1)
Capture facilities at Duck Creek and Madison River (western boundary)	✓	✓ (phase 1)		✓	✓		
Capture facilities at several locations inside park					✓	✓ (phase 2)	
Capture facilities at Duck Creek and Horse Butte (western boundary)							✓
Capture facilities at Seven-Mile Bridge (western boundary inside park)						✓	
Seronegative bison from Stephens Creek slaughtered	✓	✓ (phase 1)			✓	✓	
Seronegative bison from Stephens Creek quarantined			✓	✓			✓
Seronegative-nonpregnant bison from West Yellowstone capture facilities released onsite	✓	✓ (phase 1)		✓		✓	✓
Seronegative-pregnant bison from West Yellowstone slaughtered	✓	✓ (phase 1)					
Seronegative-pregnant bison from West Yellowstone quarantined				✓			✓(at high population levels)
Seronegative-pregnant bison from West Yellowstone released onsite						✓	
Quarantine facilities			✓	✓			✓

Action	Alternative 1: No Action – Continuation of the Current Interim Bison Management Plan	Alternative 2: Minimal Management	Alternative 3: Management, with Emphasis on Public Hunting	Alternative 4: Interim Plan with Limited Public Hunting and Quarantine	Alternative 5: Aggressive Brucellosis Control within Yellowstone National Park through Capture, Test, and Slaughter	Alternative 6: Aggressive Brucellosis Control within Yellowstone National Park through Vaccination	Alternative 7: Preferred Alternative – Manage for Specific Bison Population Range
Bison hazed into capture facilities, away from borders	✓	✓ (phase 1)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Bison crossing boundaries shot	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
SMA in Eagle Creek/Bear Creek	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓
SMA between Reese Creek and Yankee Jim Canyon on west side of Yellowstone River only			✓				✓
SMA between Reese Creek and Yankee Jim Canyon on east and west side of Yellowstone River		✓					
Western SMA including Horse Butte area	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓
Western SMA includes Cabin Creek/Lee Metcalf area	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓
Western SMA includes all land south of Buffalo Horn Creek		✓					
Bison hazed back into park from West Yellowstone in May	✓	✓ (phase 1)	✓ (phase 1)	✓		✓	✓
Bison hunted in West Yellowstone area			✓	✓ (limited)			✓ (possible)

TABLE 3: SUMMARY COMPARISON OF IMPACTS OF ALTERNATIVES

The following terms are used in this impact summary chart and throughout the environmental impact statement. In some cases, the terms are defined quantitatively. However, when they are not, the following definitions apply:

- Negligible – at lower levels of detection
- Minor – detectable, but slight
- Moderate – readily apparent environmental effects with the potential to become major
- Major – severe adverse or exceptional beneficial effects

Topic	Alternative 1: No Action	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5	Alternative 6	Alternative 7: Preferred Alternative
IMPACTS ON THE BISON POPULATION							
Estimated popula- tion size (# bison) in 2006 or later	3,100 in 2006	3,500 in 2006; moderate increase	3,500 in 2006; moderate increase	2,800 in 2006; minor decrease	2,150 in 1997 to 1,250 in 1999; up to 2,000 by 2006; major decrease	3,500 in 2010; 2,500- 2,900 in 2011; moderate to major decrease	2,700 in both 2006 and 2011; moderate to major decrease
Estimated distribution in West Yellowstone	18–52 bison	20-60 bison	16–120 bison	1–52 bison	0 bison	22–60 bison	13–51 bison
Estimated distribution in Reese Creek	0 bison	0-120 bison	60-80 bison	0 bison	0 bison	0 bison	0-100 bison
Estimated sero- prevalence rate in 2011 (70% vaccine efficacy assumed)	24%	26%; minor adverse impact	28%; minor to moderate adverse impact	26%; minor adverse impact	0%; major beneficial impact	0% by 2013; major beneficial impact	23%; negligible to minor beneficial impact
IMPACTS ON RECREATION							
Visitor experience	Minor adverse and positive impacts	No impact	Negligible adverse impact	Minor adverse and positive impacts	Minor to moderate adverse impact	Similar to, but less adverse than alternative 5	Minor adverse impact
Wildlife viewing opportunities – percent change by 2006	42% increase is bison population over 1997; minor benefit compared to existing conditions	14% increase over alternative 1; minor to moderate benefit compared to alternative 1	14% increase over alternative 1; minor to moderate benefit compared to alternative 1	8% decrease over alternative 1; minor adverse impact compared to alternative 1	35% decrease over alternative 1; moderate to major adverse impact compared to alternative 1	1% higher than alternative 1; Same as alternative 1 through the year 2009, and similar to alternative 5 after 2010	12% decrease by 2006; 23% by 2011; minor to moderate adverse impact compared to alternative 1
Winter recreation; snowmobiling	No impact	Displacement of well over 50% of oversnow park visitors; major impact on individual in-park users; minor to moderate adverse impact overall	Possible minor to major impact if research indicates road closures needed	No impact	Major impact on some individual in-park snowmobile users; minor to moderate impact overall	Similar to alternative 2 for first 10 years; then similar to alternative 5 for 2-3 years	No impact
Hunting	No impact	No impact	75-85 bison hunting permits; minor to moderate benefit	35 bison hunting permits; minor benefit	No impact	No impact	15-25 bison hunting permits; minor benefit
IMPACTS ON LIVESTOCK OPERATIONS							
Cost of vaccination and testing	2% of yearly production costs; minor impact in the long term, but more apparent in years of low cattle prices	With removal of test-eligible cattle, no testing or vaccinating in SMAs; possibly continued testing and vaccinating in areas near SMAs	Similar to alternative 2 in the long term, but smaller SMAs and possible continued presence of test-eligible herds in western SMA	Same as alternative 1	Possibly less vaccination and testing; minor beneficial impact	First 12 years, same as alternative 1; final 3 years, same as alternative 5	Same as alternative 3 north of Yellowstone National Park; same as alternative 1 west of park
Operational changes to non-breeding cattle–individual ranchers	No impact	Possible conversion of cow-calf operations; moderate to major impact on a few individual ranchers	Fewer possible conversions than in alternative 2; moderate to major impact on a few individual ranchers	No impact	No impact	No impact	No impact

Topic	Alternative 1: No Action	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5	Alternative 6	Alternative 7: Preferred Alternative
Modification of grazing on national forest allotments	No impact	Possible allotment modifications; moderate to major impact on a few ranchers using allotments now	Fewer possible modifications than in alternative 2; moderate to major impact on a few ranchers using allotments now	No impact	No impact	No impact	Short term, no impact; long-term, a few allotments on the north end may be modified; moderate to major impact on those users
Private land acquisition or easements	No impact	Possible buyouts or easements; major impact on public funds	Fewer possible buyouts or easements than in alternative 2; major impact on public funds	No impact	No impact	No impact	Same as alternative 3, but no acquisitions in West Yellowstone
Property damage by bison	Minor impact overall, but could be moderate to major for individuals affected	Short term, same as alternative 1; long term, reduced adverse impact	Short term, same as alternative 1; long-term, reduced adverse impact	Same as alternative 1	Minor impact overall, but could be a moderate to major benefit for individuals who might otherwise experience damage under interim plan	Same as alternative 1	Short term, same as alternative 1; long term, reduced adverse impact
Perception of risk	Risk exists; minor impact	Risk exists; moderate adverse impact	Until changes in operations or acquisitions occur, same as alternative 1; thereafter reduced risk	Same as alternative 1	Reduced risk, moderate beneficial impact	Slightly less, but similar to alternative 5; minor to moderate benefit	West Yellowstone, same as alternative 1; Reese Creek, reduced risk in long term
IMPACTS ON SOCIOECONOMICS – REGIONAL ECONOMY							
Impacts on regional economy from wildlife viewing	40-45% of regional economy (\$500 million) dependent on tourism	Moderately beneficial impact from increased tourism; possible gain of up to \$20 million	Similar to alternative 2	Similar to alternative 1 with hunting an additional source of local income	Major adverse impact from lost tourism; possible loss of up to \$20 million	Similar to alternative 1 in most years, possibly more adverse during parkwide capture and slaughter	Similar to alternative 1, but more adverse over long term as population numbers are lower
Impacts on regional economy from snow-mobiling	No change in existing conditions; \$30 million per winter	Loss of up to \$656,000 to \$2 million annually in West Yellowstone; negligible impact on overall economy, possible major adverse impacts on some individual businesses; possible minor positive impact in Gardiner	Same as alternative 1	Same as alternative 1	Loss of \$1.8 million to \$3.2 million annually during 3-4 years of parkwide capture, test, and slaughter	Same as alternative 2 during first 12 years, then similar to alternative 5 for 2-3 years of parkwide capture, test, and slaughter	Same as alternative 1
Impacts on regional economy from hunting	Bison hunting not allowed	Same as alternative 1	\$33,000 annual expenditures	\$15,380 annual expenditures	Same as alternative 1	Same as alternative 1	\$10,890 per year increase from fees, expenditures
Impacts on regional economy from livestock sector	Livestock cash receipts for Gallatin and Park Counties comprise 5% of livestock cash receipts statewide	A few livestock operators may relocate their private and/or federal grazing operations to other locations; adverse impact offset by increased wildlife viewing related tourism	Same as alternative 2, but fewer livestock operators potentially displaced	Same as alternative 1	Aggressive brucellosis control may increase livestock use of area; negligible benefit	Similar to alternative 5, but less beneficial to livestock operators as brucellosis eliminated more slowly	Same as alternative 3, but without the possibility of displacements in the West Yellowstone area
IMPACTS ON SOCIOECONOMICS – MINORITY AND LOW-INCOME POPULATIONS							
Minority and low-income populations	\$19,500 of bison meat donated on average per year; minor beneficial impact	Negligible adverse impact from loss of bison meat	Negligible adverse impact from loss of bison meat to hunters; negligible benefit from availability of live bison	\$23,000 per year of bison meat received; value would be higher if some bison are donated live; minor benefit	\$61,000 in meat available for 3-4 years; otherwise similar to alt 1; minor beneficial impact	\$19,000 per year donated during phase 1; Similar to alt 5 during phase 2; minor beneficial impact	\$26,000 per year of bison meat received; value would be higher if some bison are donated live; minor benefit
IMPACTS ON SOCIOECONOMICS – SOCIAL VALUES							
Social values	Minor to moderate impacts to those with humanitarian/moralistic values; negligible impact to ranching values	Minor impact on traditional ranching lifestyles; relative positive impact on moral and humanitarian attitudes; possible major impacts on individual ranchers, tribes, those with moral/humanitarian values	Minor to moderate impacts on those opposed to hunting; negligible impacts on those with humanitarian/moral values; minor impact on ranching values	Overall minor to moderate; impacts on tribes minor; ranching similar to alternative 1	Those with humanitarian/moral values, tribes, some visitors experience major impact; ranchers negligible to minor benefits from eradication of brucellosis in bison	Similar to alternative 5 during phase 2 (parkwide capture, test, and slaughter), to alternative 1 during first 12 years	Minor to moderate adverse impact on humanitarian/moral values; minor to major impact on tribes; minor impact on traditional ranching lifestyle

Topic	Alternative 1: No Action	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5	Alternative 6	Alternative 7: Preferred Alternative
IMPACTS ON SOCIOECONOMICS – NONMARKET VALUES							
Annual nonmarket values attributed to well-being of bison population	Negligible to minor beneficial impact	Major beneficial impact; \$1.6 million to \$22.9 million	Similar to or slightly less than alternative 2	Similar to alternative 1	Major adverse impact; \$1.6 to \$22.9 million opportunity cost	Same as alternative 1 until parkwide capture and slaughter, then same as alternative 5	Similar to alternative 1 in the short-term, but to alternative 5 in the long-term from decreased population size
Nonmarket values attributed to wildlife viewing	Negligible to minor beneficial impact	Impact estimate ranges from negligible benefit up to \$9.8 million	Similar to or slightly less than alternative 2	Similar to alternative 1	Impact estimate ranges from adverse negligible loss up to \$9.8 million	Same as alternative 1 until parkwide capture and slaughter, then same as alternative 5	Similar to alternative 1 in the short-term, but to alternative 5 in the long-term from decreased population size
Nonmarket values attributed to recreation or hunting	No impact	\$2.5 to \$7.6 million loss (winter recreation)	\$19,000 gain from hunting	\$11,000 gain from hunting	\$6.9 to \$8.0 million loss (recreation) during 3-4 years of park-wide capture and slaughter	\$2.5 to \$7.6 million loss (winter recreation) first 12 years; up to \$17 million loss for remaining 3-4 years	Negligible loss to recreation; minor gain to hunting (estimated \$1 1,000)
IMPACTS ON THREATENED, ENDANGERED, AND SENSITIVE SPECIES							
Peregrine falcon	No impact	No impact	No impact	No impact	No impact	No impact	No impact
Bald eagle	Potential human disturbance impacts reduced to negligible through avoidance mitigation	No impact	No impact	Same as alternative 1	Potential direct effect on wintering eagles from capture facility in Madison River area; major impact possible	Potential major adverse impact on one pair of nesting bald eagles from construction of a capture facility at Seven-Mile Bridge	Same as alternative 1
Analysis area grizzly bear – carrion supply	Slower than natural increase to maximum bison population level would have negligible impact	Quicker growth of bison population, largest range; moderate benefit compared to alternative 1 to bears by increasing carrion foraging	Minor benefit to bears compared to alternative 1 from increased growth rate, range of bison population	Same as alternative 1	Rapid decrease in bison numbers, reduction in carrion foraging opportunities for bears from range of bison population; moderate to major adverse impact	Same as alternative 1	Bison numbers less than alternative 1; bison numbers to be monitored in the park to ensure sufficient numbers to protect foraging opportunities resulting in a negligible impact
Park interior grizzly bear – carrion supply	Groomed roads now allow bison to leave park during severe winter; negligible impact on bear carrion supply	Closing groomed roads to snowmobiles may keep bison in interior; minor to moderate beneficial impact on bear carrion supply by increased winterkill	Same as alternative 1	Same as alternative 1	Rapid decrease in bison numbers, reduction in carrion foraging opportunities for bears from range of bison population; moderate to major adverse impact	Same as alternative 1	Same as alternative 1
Grizzly bear – human confrontations	Possibility of human/bear encounter and bear being shot increased by bison management actions; currently mitigated by removal of bison viscera, body parts after shooting	Fewer bison likely shot because of larger SMAs, more dispersed shooting; beneficial impact compared to alternative 1	Possibility of human/bear encounter and bears being shot increased by bison hunting; impact reduced to negligible through hunter education	Same as alternative 3	Same as alternative 1	Same as alternative 1	Same as alternative 3
Grizzly bear – bison management activities	Potential disturbance and displacement caused by hazing and shooting of bison; negligible impact; no or negligible impact from capture facilities, as bears are denning	Potential temporary disturbance and displacement caused by hazing and shooting of bison; negligible impact, as most occurs during denning period	Same as alternative 1	Same as alternative 1	Same as alternative 1	Same as alternative 1	Same as alternative 1
Gray wolves – human confrontation	No impact	No impact	Possibility of a human/wolf encounter and wolf being shot increased by bison hunting; impact reduced to negligible through hunter education	Same as alternative 3	No impact	No impact	Same as alternative 3